There is a [illegible]

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Geol 35-17

Precede

1918-19

(Geol)

File No. 53-18

Serial Nos. 1-7

Later references.

Geol 53-18(8,10,11,12)
" 69-19(3&4)
" 93-19(1-3
Geol 37-24(-3)

(86)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-7

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Irregularities in the Dept of Mines & Geology in respect of certain cheques received.

G 28 47071/9 24-6-19.

To The Director of Mines & Geology
The Comptroller to Govt.

Passes orders in the matter of certain cheques that were received in the Dept & kept unearned.

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-18

(For Disposal by Circulation)

No. C. 833

20/5/1919.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

COUNCIL MATTER.

SUBJECT.

Draft Government order and draft letter to Dr. W.F.Smeeth in regard to certain irregularities in the Department of Mines and Geology.

CIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

By Order,

C B Balasundaram

Chief *Secretary to Government.*

21st May 1919.

Extraordinary Member of Council. Sen. Khan 30.5.19.

17/6/19 26.5.19 **First Member of Council.**

Second Member of Council. Opinion recorded.

Third Member of Council.

WD 2670—GPB—1,000—11-5-17

Recirculated

Informal.

(For Disposal at next Meeting)

No. C. 278

25. 9. 1918

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

COUNCIL MATTER.

SUBJECT.

Irregularities in the Department of Mines and Geology in respect of cheques received.

RECIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.
with reference to Council opinion on page 15 of the Notes

By Order,

C. Balasundaram

25th Septr. 1918

Chief Secretary to Government.

File Recirculated

Extraordinary Member of Council.

1403 27/9 First Member of Council. 27/9

Second Member of Council.

945-2/5 25.9.18 Extra Member of Council.

WD 2500—GPB—1,000—11-5-17

26.9.18

Opinion recorded

25.9.18

Seen

Temporary Member of Council.

17/9/18

Geol 53-18

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Two letter from the Director of Mine & Geology bringing to notice certain irregularities in the Dept in respect of cheques received, are submitted for perusal in the first instance.

The cases will be worked up & submitted later on in due course

2nd member
for.

CBS
29/VI/18

Mal'son might
worked up the cases &
recommend
how
best to proceed

W. Otter Barker
Asst to S Dr
Prog. Dept for a
few days
26/8/18

CBS

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

W.D. 84—GPB—60,000—20-7-15

1/5/18

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Geol File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.

From the Offg Director, Dept of Geology.

No 2578 A 13/23 - 4-18

States for reasons given, that the sum of Rs 403-12-0 on account of rent etc due in respect of the Badamakanhalli Gold mining block may be written off the accounts, that the cheque dated 10-3-98 for Rs 1000/- on account of deposit presented by the applicants has not been cashed & it is not possible to say under what circumstances it was not cashed & reports that a statement showing all uncashed cheques in the office with a brief history of the case relating to each cheque is submitted separately for orders of Govt.

detained & submitted separately.

From the same officer.

No. 2579 A 13/23 - 4-18.

States that, in dealing with the question of arrears due in respect of certain mining blocks, it was observed that a number of stale dated cheques received from 1897 to 1907 were lying in the iron safe of his office & forwards for orders of Govt, a list of cheques with a brief history in each case & a note by Mr. R. Rebbok

1) From the list forwarded by the Offg Director, it can be seen that ~~only~~ there are 55 uncashed cheques amounting to Rs 15,853-8-5; Out of these

(i) a sum of Rs 450/- may be adjusted out of deposits presented by licensees;

Ss. 10, 24, 25, 29.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Genl File No. 53 of 1917-19

Serial No.

Rs 31, 46

1, 6, 7, 15-20, 21, 37, 36-42, 45, 47-55.

4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 23, 26, 28, 31-35, 43, 44.

3, 4, 9, 11, 14, 22, 25, 30.

(ii) a sum of Rs 113-8-5 may be recovered from the applicants concerned;

(iii) cheques amounting to Rs 6,990/- may be returned to the applicants concerned, as the deposits are returnable to them owing to the non acceptance of the terms imposed, areas being not free, long delay in offering the licenses or leases on account of revision of rules;

(iv) no action is necessary in regard to the cheques amounting to Rs 4250/- as the parties themselves did not care to take back stale dated cheques though they were offered to be returned to them owing to the rejection of applications, areas being not free etc; and

(v) cheques for the remaining amount of Rs 4050/- require explanation. These are dues to Govt on account of deposits, rents etc from Applicants for mining leases etc and have not been cashed and have become stale and worthless.

A note on the subject by Mr. B. Subba Rao is in the file.

2) The person or persons responsible for not cashing these cheques in time & crediting the amounts to Treasury and steps that may be taken for the recoupment of the amounts have not been reported by the Offg Director. If approved this information may be called for.

AMS.
3/4-5-18

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Gen'l File No. 53 of 1917-18.

Serial No.

3 On Going Carefully through the list, I find that the facts have not been fully stated in respect of Case No 3. The facts recited in the list do not show that any money is due to Govt ~~in respect~~ but it is seen from another reference made by the Director that the lease was Cancelled in August 1907, when the deposit of Rs 1000 was ordered to be Confiscated and that there are Arrears of Rent and Local Cess Amounting to Rs 403-12-0. It is possible that there may be other similar omissions in the list. The Director may therefore be called upon to furnish at once information as to the ~~Case~~ Sums now actually due to Govt out of those set forth in the list As it is ~~not~~ likely that he may recover some of these Amounts from the parties Concerned, he may be asked to address them and to recover as much as he can. In respect of the balance he may be called upon to report who were responsible for not Cashing the Cheques and why the Amounts should not be recovered from

was in Branch III

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

8526 4

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Genl File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.

Hyam
Courtney) 16/5/18

5 2nd member

16/5/18

16/5/18

6 I do not quite follow the Secretariat note.

The list is a commendable one and shows the utmost neglect in this dept to safeguard Govt revenue —

8 The Offg Director also has shirked his responsibility in failing to make definite recommendations in each case as to what is to be taken in such case should be examined carefully — and def. info (1) invited as to whether the amounts are shld due — (2) whether the amounts are recoverable & upto if appeals &/or remissions are pending

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

8546/9549

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Genl File No. 53 of 1918-19.

Serial No.

3) Whether branches which
submit cheques are not punctual
& hence the cheques are
not to be pursued further
Even in such cases the
parties must know that
cheques are not taken
& no be made clear
to the agency will please
go into the matter afresh
and prepare a
fresh statement & in
final wise in the
light of these remarks

h/)
D. S

4/8/18

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

G.R.S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

8546 9549 53-18

From The Offg. Director, Dept of Geology
D.O. No 2905 & 28-5-18.
Requests that the files forwarded with his office letter No 25-79 & 13/23-4-18 maybe returned to enable him to prepare the different statements required in respect of certain cheques received in the Dept & kept uncashed.

11 Submitted with a draft.

A/S
29-5-18.

12 June

30/5

No. & 16404 dt 31-5-18

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT V GENERAL 1-JUN-1918

13 May this file be sent to Branch VIII for favour of information & return

A/S
12-6-18.

Submd: may this be entered in the E. A.-G. Register.

14/6

It appears unnecessary to register this as an enquiry

GRSM.592

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT V GENERAL 14 JUN. 1918

Marked & returned with Compliments

14/6

E. A. M. 29-17

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form.

5-2-18

Submitted with a draft reminder to the Offg Director of Geology.

AMS.
19-7-18.

Issued G 1760 Q 23-7-18.

Submitted with a draft reminder.

AMS.
7-8-18.

Issued
Q 2852 Q 8.8.1918

8546 G.S.
2804

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Geo File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.

From the offg Director, Geol Survey
D.O. no 438 dy 9/10-8-18.
States, with reference to the detailed information called for in regard to certain cheques that were kept uncashed in the acct, that each case is being carefully looked into & noted upon by the Registrar & that in formation a detailed report in the matter will be submitted from after his return from Sakesar
1 Submitted for perusal. Report may be awaited.
ATH 14-8-18. (Chief Secy)

Mw 14.8.18

Extra member
Secy.

192-58
19.8.18.

Pending receipt of the further detailed report promised a statement of the uncashed cheques may be called for
Phel
20.8.18.

1. Dft as above
2. Put up the file
Mw 22/8

Submitted. The statement of the uncashed cheques, which has been submitted by the offg Director is now before the Financial Secretary to Govt. His return may be awaited
ATH 23-8-18 (Chief Secy)

Mw 24/8/18

If approved the file will be returned to Finance & in that case I shall be prepared to move in Govt.
Please get the file submitted if the member

The file referred to has been obtained from the Financial Secretariat & submitted herewith with the opinion of the Financial Secy recorded therein.
ATH 27-8-18. (Chief Secy)

Mw

Secy
26/8

NOTE—Contd. sheet.

333-203
28-8-18.

Extra member
D 70

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S. 7

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

2804
4752

Gen' File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.

I have seen the Dy Secy's note in the linked file & I generally agree with him in the views expressed in it. The matter may be discussed in Council if the Dewan approves.

Rec'd
31.8.18

3 May this file be submitted to the Dewan? (Chief Secy)

Rec'd
3/9

35 May be brought up at meeting. (Dewan)

1861
3.9.18

3/9/18
Rec'd
3/9

36

11.9.18

13-9-18

Send the offg Director, Dept of Geology
D.O. 747 dt 13-9-18
Furnishes the detailed information called in D.O. letter dt 31-5-18.
Submitted
17-9-18.

Rec'd
7/9

807-77
18.9.18

37 Chief Secy
38 Extra member

Rec'd
17/9/18

39 a dotpl recvd of Mach[ine] management.

Rec'd
18/9

Rec'd
20.9.18

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-8-18—S.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Geol File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.

Leo Branch. Please add up the items I have marked R, D, L and N in the statement separately & resubmit

Mw 24/9/18

W | Resubmitted with a statement as directed.

Hlls 23-9-18 Lt 2

Resubmitted with the Director's letter forwarding a detailed statement. An analysis of the figures and the notes brings out the following results: —

		Rs
	Total amount of cheques uncashed	15853-8-
(N)	deduct Cases in which the uncashing has not given rise to any loss either to the party or to Govt and in which no action is necessary	9750-0-
	Balance Cases in which financial liability continues	6103-8-1
	made up of	
(R)	Amounts due to Govt and recoverable	2353-8-1
(D)	Amounts due to Govt as Penalty but irrecoverable and involving no real loss to Govt	1600-0-
(L)	Amounts due to Govt as rent or as reimbursing expenditure and irrecoverable and causing therefore so much clear and absolute loss	1150-0-

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

G. R. S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 53 of 191 8-17

Serial No.

The following action may be taken in regard to these cheques: —

Those shown in class R to be returned to parties wherever possible & the others allowed to remain along the office papers.

The Director to take immediate action for the recovery of the amounts coming in class R and to submit quarterly report of progress of recoveries until the whole amt is recovered

Amounts under class I to be written off - no action being taken to recover the amounts from the persons responsible as the non-cashing has entailed no real loss to Govt.

The amounts under class L represent so much clear loss to be recovered from the persons responsible for the non encashment of the cheques.

Ref. paras 35 and 36 above

(Chief Secy) 24/9/18

I think the whole Rs 103 odd should be recovered either from parties officers responsible

CSJ 24/9/18

C.S

Circulate & note for next meeting.

CSJ 24/9/18

P.T.O.

24/9

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Govt File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.

I agree with the Ch. Secy. I think the full sum of Rs 6103/- shd now be recovered from the parties or the Officers concerned. But if some consideration is to be shown then the sum of Rs 1600/- reported to be irrecoverable & Ld involving any actual loss to Govt may be remitted. Bdg. shd be taken & receipt the balance.

Pull
25.9.18

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

D 4 15

Informal. C.26.8.

Subject.-

Irregularities in the Department of Mines and Geology in respect of cheques received.

To Opinion of the Council.

Immediate action should be taken to recover Rs 3353 odd that is said to be recoverable from parties

~~Director should report as to Heads responsible for the loss + also how the account should be apportioned the liability among them recouped from~~

Comptroller should be addressed to withhold payment of Bonus to Mr Subbarao - Retd Asst Secy

Detailed explanation should be obtained on his return

In regard to items of 1600 + 1150 Rs officers responsible should recoup the loss to Govt.

Well 30/9/18

30.9

30.9.18

To the Assistant Secretary, (Miscellaneous), for necessary action.

1/10/18

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Gen File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.

Branch.

51 Please draft a G.O. stating the facts of the case & appending the Director's Statement of cheques, classifying the ~~dat~~ loss and authorizing Council resolution

5 Submitted with a draft

3-10-18. [illegible] Gen file

A typed draft is sent.

5/11/18 [illegible]

53 Chiefs

7.11

54 Draft may be approved. The delay due to the illness of the assistant & other pressure work may be kindly overlooked.

Extra member

19.11.18

55 Draft approved

20.11.18

56 Issue

23/11/18

Subtd. is ascertained no payment has been made. Rs. 6162 is payable to Mr. Brahmaiah as Secretary's Value 18/11/18

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—10,000—13-6-14

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Genl File No. 53 of 1918

Serial No.

R. 1142-18

53 Reference is invited to Financial Secretary's note of 26.8.18 in the linked file (Genl. 124-17)- Draft Pair communicating the order solicited.

Illegible 58 R/1917 58 Communicated 12/12

10 XII 18

3 To

The Director Deptt: Mines & Geol
" Comptroller through Accl. Deptt
" Secretary Mysore State Life Insurance Com

G. 10837-9 of 9.12.18.

passes orders in the matter of encashed cheques of the Deptt

Files 60

Have the connected records been yet sent to D. Smeeth as directed in the concluding paragraph of the G.O of 9.12.18? If not, no further time should be lost in sending them as intended In case sent, the matter should be kept alive by issuing reminders till a response is forthcoming.

Reed
6.1.19

61 Bor. Remind me 6/1/19.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

8546

18

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Gol File No. 53 of 1918-19.

Serial No.	
	62 Submitted with a draft
	Advd 6-1-19. 63 Issue draft Nov 8/1/19.
	Issue vide C. 14134 dt 11-1-19

Action taken to issue telegram to the Viceroy as desired.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

P.T.O.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

8546 '17

19

64 Extract from G.I. 147 of 18-19.

I think that Rs 1500 maybe paid to Mr. Subba Rao, pending final orders in the matter

(Initialled) Jutd, C&S
24/1/19

Making the necessary margin for safety, the balance of amount due may, I think, be paid. As I have reason to believe that Mr. Subba Rao's circumstances are by no means satisfactory at present. Since the accounts dept have mentioned the figure of Rs 1500/- maybe paid to him now pending finalisation of account.

It is not fair to keep one waiting long in such matters & the Director, M.R. should be advised to expedite disposal of cases all possible delay being carefully avoided

Jutd, P.R.R
28-1-19.

H. D. Please take extract & remind only

Jutd, C&S.
30-1-19.

Branch Jutd, 31-1-19.

65

Submitted with a draft reminder.

AHS.
1-2-19.

Lily 66 Issue. Do.
Submit for approval to Chief's Secy
4/L.

CHIEF'S SECRETARIAT
IV
MINOR Depts:
7 FEB 1919

G 16436 of 62

19

Sub A

13692
2546

20

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Geol File No. 53 of 1918-19

Serial No.	
4	From the Financial Secretary to Govt No 7L 3835-7 & 6-2-19 G.7147-18. States that a sum of Rs 1500/- has been ordered by Govt to be paid to Mr. B. Subba Rao out of his insurance bonus, pending final order in the matter dealt with in the Govt order of 9-12-18. Submitted. AHS. 7-2-19. Ug 67 Await D.' Smeeth's rpt by me 13/2
5	From the Director, Dept of Mines & Geology No 2359 & 22-2-19. Submits his remarks & explanations regarding certain cheques that were kept uncashed in the Dept. 68 Submitted with reference to paragraph 60 above. AHS. 25-2-19. Ug 69 Of the four statements appended to the Govt order of 9.12.18 on the cheques shown in St A no action is necessary (Vide Para 3 of the order). 70 The amounts shown in St B are recoverable and the director says he is taking action. 71 Statement C relates to amounts which could be forfeited as penalty but the non forfeiture of which caused no loss to Govt. These amounts the Direc

SUBJECT
CHIEF CLERK
RECEIVED
13 FEB 1919

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

Serial No.

stales were all deposits under the rules of 1904 and 1906 which had no clear provision for forfeiture on non acceptance of a lease offered. (Under these rules there was no provision for any "application fee" which could be forfeited. Please see copies putup.) This view does not seem quite correct but it is the fact that the deposit amount declared confiscable seems really for large a/c for mere non acceptance of a lease offered and this must have been why an application fee which could be ~~confisca~~ forfeited more justly in such cases was prescribed in the rules of 1910. for this reason and for that urged in para 13 of Mr Sweet's letter and in view of the Members remarks in para 47 above (second sentence) it is for consideration whether the cheques shown in ~~this~~ statement C may not be treated similarly with those in Stt A as the amounts ordered not to be recovered from the officers responsible.

The statement D shows are only two items. The first item, the Director recommends may be written off. as The

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Genl File No. 53 of 1918-19.

Serial No.

Responsibility cannot be fixed on any person within reach now. This may perhaps be done. The second item of Rs 150/- for this amount, the Director states, accountant Singaravelar (now dead) must be considered as really responsible, but Mr Subbaraya Aiyar, he is of opinion, had failed to exercise sufficient control and supervision. Perhaps this amount may be recovered from the officers responsible. It has to be settled in what proportion if any their officers besides Mr Subbaraya is held accountable. The amount, however is a small amount.

The financial responsibilities in the case however do not end with this. The amounts shown in Statement B are said to be recoverable but if they are not all recovered, whatever portion remains unrecovered should, under the orders of Government, be properly recouped by the officers responsible. The exact amount which would have to be so recouped can be ascertained only when the result of the action now taken for recovering the amounts from the parties has been ascertained.

Forwarded.

Chief Secy

Ins 1/3

Notes Pages 33 & 34 and D.O. Lr. No. 2847 Genl 3-8-19 are in a sealed cover & kept in this file.

NOTE—Contn. sheet 24-6-19

G. R. S. IV—6]

Submitted to His Highness.

I submit herewith a Final Note by the.....Second *Member of Council on the* ~~*subject of*~~.....irregularities in the department of Mines and Geology in respect of certain cheques received in payment of departmental dues, *for His Highness' gracious approval.*

Dewan.

6.6.19

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

Irregularities in the department of Mines and Geology, in respect of certain cheques received in payment of departmental dues.

1298

Order.

~~KRW~~

14/6/19

Chief secy 14.6

37

G. R. S. III-2]

C 833.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Genl File No. of 191

Serial No.

(*)

31. All urgent or confidential files returned with His Highness' orders may, in the absence of instructions or indications to the contrary, be ordinarily circulated to the Members of Council for perusal after the issue of orders.

33. The Secretaries concerned should see that orders in the cases referred to above are issued at once and that the files are returned immediately after to the Chief Secretary for circulation to the Members.

34. In all other cases, the files will first be circulated to the Members of Council at headquarters and then sent to the Secretariat concerned for the issue of orders.

Circulated to the Members of Council for perusal of (*).

His Highness' orders before ~~after~~ issue of orders. (*Vide* Rules 31, 33 and 34 of the Subsidiary Rules for the conduct of business of Council in the Manual of Council Rules and Procedure).

C S Balasundaram
Chief Secretary to Govt. 15/6/19

Through the Secretary to Government.

....Department.

2024
20.6.19

FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL

7904-50
17.6.19

SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL Genl
orders may issue
18.6.19

5235
16.6.19

TEMPORARY MEMBER OF COUNCIL.
15/6.

Issue
orders
20/6/19

NOTE.—Contn. sheet

WD 1573—GPB—300—4-3-19

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 5 of 191 E.-17.

Serial No.

6 To

The Director Dept: of Mines & Geol.
& Comptroller to Govt

G. 28470-71 of 24. 6. 1919

passes orders in the matter of uncashed cheques of the department & awaits the further report from the Director as to the progress made in the recovery of amounts

7 To

The Smeeth, Director of Mines & Geol.

G. 28472 of 24. 6. 1919

Incurs ~~Confidential~~ instructions as regards the responsibility of the Head of the Dept: for proper accounting ~~Reporting~~ of moneys received in the Dept: &c.

Refers.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2037—GPB—2,000—7-3-17.

D.M.G. 13]

~~BANGALORE~~, Camp Goldhal, 13 April 1918.

No. 2579 Esle Files referred to in the list of Mr. B. Subba Rao note in original } 23

RECEIVED 25 APR 1918

8546

18 - 19
Gpl53-18

FROM

B. JAYARAM, Esq., F.G.S.,

Offg. *Director ~~(in charge)~~, Department of ~~Mines and~~ Geology, Mysore State.*

00596

To

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A

Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

SIR

I have the honour to report for the information of Government that in dealing with the question of the arrears of mining rent due on the Badamakanhalli block in the Bowringpet Taluk (vide this Office File No. 48 of 1904-05 submitted separately with my letter No 2578 dated 23rd april 1918.) and certain other files of papers which were in the personal custody of Mr. B. Subba Rao (Asst. Secretary to Government), late Registrar of this Department, and were delivered over by him to this office in August 1917, it was observed that a number of stale dated cheques received from 1897 to 1907 were lying in the iron safe of this office. Steps were immediately taken for the preparation of a list of the cheques together with a history of the case in respect of each of the cheques. The list so prepared is submitted herewith for the information and orders of Government together with a note in original by Mr. B. Subba Rao.

2. The files of papers relating to the cheques are also forwarded herewith for reference and kind return.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

B. Jayaram

Offg. Director,
Department of Geology.

Departmen

List of uncashed Cheques -

Serial No.	Amount of Cheque.	Number of Cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	Received from.
	Rs.					
1.	500	A.074976.	10-11-97.	Hajee Ismail Sait.	Bank of Madras.	Hajee Ismail Sait.
2.	500	C.588182.	9-5-99.	Do.	National Bank of India.	Do.
3.	1000	A.066406.	10-3-98.	A.H.Harden	Bank of Madras.	Binny & Co.
4.	1000	22A.1043/4070	2-4-98.	R.Knight & Sons.	Bengal Bank.	Paul Knight & Robert Knight.
5.	500	S_S90?5.	20-8-06.	Sutherland Orr.	Arbuthnot & Co.	Sutherland Orr.
6.	100	B.531881.	14-9-06.	A.E.Dawson.	Madras Bank.	J.E.Limouzin.

Rs.

f Mines and Geology.

received from 1897 to 1907.)

History of the case.

These two cheques were submitted in the first instance on account of the fee for two applications for prospecting licenses in the Bowringpet Taluk. Subsequently a mining lease was applied for with the aggregate amount of the cheques Rs.1000/- as the deposit. The lease was issued on January 1907. The lessee failed to register the lease as required by the rules. The rent on the mining block was also in arrears. A sum of Rs.680 being the rent and local cess is reported to be due for the first year of the lease and the cancellation of the deed and the adjustment of the said arrears out of the deposit have been in this office No. 2024 dated 29-3-1915 recommended to Government. Orders of Government are still awaited. In the meantime, it is observed that the cheques are stale and cannot be cashed. Steps ought to have been taken at the time of the grant of the lease to have the stale dated cheques replaced by either a fresh cheque or the money in cash. The omission to do so was probably due to the absence of any note in the file that the cheques had not been cashed but were lodged within the office safe.

File sent to G.R of S. with No 2024 dated 9.3.15. (32/02.05) Submitted on 8.5.15

This cheque was received on account of the deposit for a mining lease in the Bowringpet Taluk. The lease - No.107 - was issued on 2nd June 1905; but at the time of its issue steps were not taken to have the stale dated cheque replaced. The omission is probably due to a similar reason as that noted above in the case of serial numbers 1 and 2.

-do- to the Chief Secretary with No. 257,8 dated 23 April 18 (48/02.05) sent herewith (50/02.05)

This cheque was received on account of the deposit for a mining lease in the Bowringpet Taluk. The lease - No.108 - was issued in June 1905. Steps were not taken for the replacement of the cheque at the time of the issue of the lease probably for a similar reason as that noted in case of Nos.1 and 2.

This cheque was received on account of the deposit for a prospecting license in the Chennarayapatna Taluk. The license was offered to the applicant but the applicant withdrew the application. The applicant was informed that the deposit would be credited to the Government under the rules and a fresh cheque was called for from him, as Messrs. Arbuthnot & Co., Madras, had then failed. The applicant was then away in England; and on his behalf Messrs. Orr, David and Brightwell wrote that they would forward this office communication to him and communicate with us on receipt of his instructions. No further action has been taken in the matter and it is understood that the applicant has since died.

-do- (138/02.07)

This is a cheque received on account of the deposit for a prospecting license for manganese in the Shimoga and Sorab Taluks. The entire area applied for was not free and the applicant was also allowed the option of withdrawing the application. The deposit is, therefore, returnable to him. The cheque may, therefore, be returned to the party.

-do- (161/06.07)

WD.

erial No.	Amount of cheque.	Number of Cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	Received from.
	Rs.					
7.	100-0-0.	B.048866.	19-10-06.	C.B.Oakley.	Madras Bank.	F.H. Oakley.
8.	100-0-0.	B.533013.	24-11-06.	A.S. Andrews.	Do.	A.S. Andrews.
9.	100-0-0.	C.801656.	5-12-06.	C. B. Oakley.	Do.	C.B. Oakley.
10.	50-0-0.	168206.	20- 2-07.	Secretary, M.M.M. Syndicate.	Mercantile Bank of India.	M.M.M.Syndicate.
11.	150-0-0.	A.070502.	21- 2-07.	A.Narainsami Mudr. & Co.	Madras Bank.	A, Maigondadeva Mudaliar.

History of the Case.

This cheque was received in respect of an application for a prospecting license for manganese in the Kadur Taluk. The applicant was offered a license on payment of an increased rate of rent at Rs.100/- per square mile instead of at Rs.50/- per square mile payable under the rules under which the application was submitted. The applicant made a protest against the demand for the increased rent and subsequently permission was granted to him to withdraw the application and claim back the deposit. No claim has been received. The deposit is, however, returnable and the cheque may, therefore, be returned to the party.	Sent herewith. (126/06-07)
This cheque was received in payment of the deposit for a prospecting license applied for, for manganese in the Tiptur Taluk. The applicant was offered the license, but he requested permission to reduce the block from 10 to 1 or 2 square miles. A reasonable reduction was permitted with the stipulation that in any case the rent leviable would not be less than half of that payable in respect of the original area of the ten square miles. No action has been taken and the matter was ordered to lie over until somebody else applied for the area in question.	— do — (129/06-07)
This cheque was received on account of the deposit in respect of an application for a prospecting license for manganese in the Tirthahalli Taluk. The license, No. 118 was issued on 9th February 1907. The cheque was not cashed at the time of the issue of the license. The license has been cancelled from 9th February 1907. It is reported by the Deputy Commissioner that 60 pits have been made under the license and that the cost of filling them up is estimated to amount to Rs.169-6-0. ------The licensee has been called upon to arrange for filling up the pits to the satisfaction of the Deputy Commissioner. If this is done, the deposit will be returnable to the licensee and the stale dated cheque may then be returned to him.	— do — (173/06-07)
This cheque was received on account of the rent for the first year for prospecting license No.126 granted to the Madras-Mysore Mining Syndicate,Limited. It should have been cashed simultaneously with the issue of the license. There is a deposit of Rs.100/- held by Government in respect of this license and a claim of Rs.3/- against the Company on account of the cost of filling up certain excavations made under the license. Out of the ~~license~~ balance of Rs.97/- the amount of the cheque - Rs.50/- may be adjusted.	— do — (109/06-07)
This cheque was received on account of the rent payable in advance for the first year, for prospecting license No.124. The amount of the cheque should have been realised and credited to Government at the time of the issue of the license. This has not been done. The deposit held in respect of it paid by the licensee has been refunded to him. The licensee has since died and there is, therefore, no means of recovering the amount.	— do — (180/06-07)

Jw.

Serial No.	Amount of Cheque.	Number of Cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	Received from.
12.	100-0-0.	E.35930.	8- 3-07.	M. Byannah.	Bangalore Bank.	M. Byannah.
13.	100-0-0.	A.074382.	15- 4-07.	C.B.Oakley.	Madras Bank.	C.B. Oakley.
14.	100-0-0.	212955.	16- 4-07.	Attorney, Mysore Manganese Co.	Mercantile Bank of India.	Mysore Manganese Co.
15.	100-0-0.	A.074402.	22- 5-07.	C.B. Oakley.	Madras Bank.	M.J.Limouzin.
16.	100-0-0.	A.074403.	22- 5-07.	Do.	Do.	E.E.Limouzin.
17.	100-0-0.	A.074404.	22- 5-07.	Do.	Do.	A.W.Kummer.
18.	100-0-0.	A.074405.	22- 5-07.	Do.	Do.	Philip A.Dinglsy
19.	100-0-0.	A.074406.	22- 5-07.	Do.	Do.	S.C.Roberts.
20.	100-0-0.	A.074407.	22- 5-07.	Do.	Do.	J. Cartner.

History of the case.

Seal hence (208/06-07)

This cheque was received on account of the deposit in respect of an application for a prospecting license for Manganese in the Shikarpur Taluk. A license was offered to the applicant over the whole of the area applied for by him with the exception of a very small portion that was not free. The applicant accepted the license but requested that it may be issued on payment of the rent of Rs.50/- per square mile as in the case of general licenses, instead of at Rs.100/- per square mile for licenses for Manganese or Chromium. This request was refused and the deposit was ordered to be confiscated. The part rent of Rs.450/- sent by the applicant by means of a cheque was ordered to be refunded to him. The cheque received from the applicant on account of the deposit of Rs.100/- having become stale dated at the time of the disposal of the application, the applicant was asked to forward the amount either by a fresh cheque or in cash. No action has been taken by him in the matter and nothing can be now be done.

—do— (297/06-07)

This cheque was received as deposit for a prospecting license for Manganese in the Shikarpur Taluk. The major portion of the area over which the license was applied for was not free and only the free portion was offered to the applicant with permission to extend the area if he wished to do so, no action has been taken by the applicant in respect of the notice issued to him that the application will be cancelled and the deposit forfeited, if no reply were received within seven ~~days~~ days from the date of the notice. As the whole of the area was not offered to the applicant, the deposit is returnable to him, although he has been informed that it would be confiscated for his omission to reply to the communication from this office. As the cheque has not been cashed, no action appears to be necessary now.

—do— (49/05-06)

This cheque was received in payment of a portion of the rent due for the renewal of prospecting license - No.28 - held by the Mysore Manganese Co.,Ld., for a period of one year from 11th April 1907. The license was duly renewed but the cheque received for the rent had not been cashed and is now stale dated and useless. This is probably because of the neglect of the accountant.

—do— 345/06-07 . 347/06-07 343/06-07 . 342/06-07 341/06-07 & 344/06-07

The cheques in these cases were received on account of deposits in respect of certain prospecting licenses for Manganese. The licenses were offered to the applicants and the rent payable in advance in respect of the same was also demanded. There has been no response from many of them. Notices were duly issued to them intimating the cancellation of their applicationsand ~~for~~ the forfeiture of their deposits. In the case of cheques Nos.15 & 16; fresh ones were called for in lieu of the stale dated cheques but no action has been taken by the applicants. Subsequently in 1912, on a representation made by the Secretary of the Shimoga Manganese Co., all the stale dated cheques were offered to be returned.(Vide letter No.280, dated 27th July 1912, to the Secretary of that Company in file No.76/11-12.)

Ne O.

Serial No.	Amount of cheque. Rs.	Number of cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	Received from.
21.	100	A.026546	22-5-07.	M.Abdul Lattief.	Madras Bank.	M.A.Lattief & Y. Nanjundayya.
22.	100	B.019399	29-5-07.	Hajee Ismail Sait.	Do.	A.Hameed.
23.	100	A.074412	3-6-07.	C.B.Oakley.	Do.	P.A.Ramaiyya.
24.	200	A.223763	Do.	Secretary, Madras Mysore Mining Syndicate.	Mercantile Bank of India.	M.M.M.Syeed.
25.	600	B.534289	4-6-07.	Abdual Sattar.	Madras Bank.	Ahmed Sait.

K.S.P.

History of the case.

This cheque was received on account of the deposit for a prospecting license applied for on the 22nd May 1907 under the rules of March 1904 over a block of 6 sq. miles of land in the Chennarayapatna Taluk. Before any orders of the Government were communicated to the applicants, they withdrew the application and the rules of 1904 provided for no penalty whatever for the withdrawal of the application; and the deposit received was strictly speaking held to be returnable to the applicants. The levy of a fee of Rs.10 for the registration of the application was, however, considered reasonable and the applicants have been called upon to pay the same. The cheque received may be returned to the party on receipt of the fee of Rs.10.

Sent herewith (346/06-07)

In this case the party had applied for a prospecting license over a block of 12 sq. miles of land in the Arsikere Taluk. The dimensions of the block were not in accordance with the rules, as the length exceeded its breadth and the applicant was called upon to revise the block in conformity with the rules. Thereupon he applied for 2 separate licenses over the area and sent in the cheque in question in payment of the deposit for the second license. The first cheque received for the first license has been cashed but not the one now in question received for the second license. The licenses were offered to the applicant and the rent due was also demanded. No action has been taken by him and strictly speaking the deposits for both the licenses are liable to be confiscated to Government; whereas we have only one of the two deposits in the Treasury and there is no second deposit as this cheque is now stale and useless.

—do— (20/06-07)

This cheque was received as a deposit in respect of a prospecting license for manganese applied for by Mr. Ramaiah. The applicant has failed to comply with the demand for the rent payable for the license. This is one of the applications in which the Shimoga Manganese Company was interested. The stale dated cheque was in this office letter No.280, dated 27th July 1912 to the Secretary of that company, offered to be returned in response to the application was from the company for the refund of the deposit. The cheque being useless the company did not evidently care to take it back.

—do— (365/06-07)

This cheque was received in respect of the rent for prospecting license No.189 granted to the Madras Mysore Syndicate. The license termintated on the 30th June 1908 and has been cancelled. The cheque should have been credited to Government before the issue of the license in 1907. There is a deposit of Rs.100 held by Government in respect of the license. This may be appropriated towards a portion of the rent due and the balance appropriated out of the refundable deposits held in respect of the other license granted to the Syndicate.

—do— (206/06-07)

This cheque was received in respect of the rent payable for prospecting license No.182 granted to Mr. Ahmed Sait of the English Warehouse, Bangalore. There is a deposit of Rs.100 - which is refundable to the licensee and this may be appropriated towards a portion of the rent and the balance, viz. Rs.500 demanded from the party.

—do— (333/06-07)

Ans.

Serial no.	Amount of Cheque.	Number of Cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	Received from.
26.	100	B.537971. ~~B534289~~.	5-6-07.	C.B.Oakley.	Madras Bank.	C.B.Oakley.
27.	100	C.802078.	6-7-07.	G.F.Baker.	Do.	G.F.Baker.
28.	100	A.078453	Do.	A.E.Dawson.	Do.	C.B.Oakley.
29.	100	230225/ 5774.	13-7-07.	Managing Director, Anglo Indian Trading Co.	Mercantile Bank of India.	M.M.M.Syeed.
30.	100	A.073320.	19-7-07.	J.B.Forster.	Madras Bank.	F.E.Dunne.
31.	100	E.43599.	4-6-07.	Abraham & Co.	Bangalore Bank.	H.Abraham.
32.	450	E.35934.	27-4-07.	T.Byannah.	Do.	T.Byannah.

Kas.

History of the case.

This cheque was received on account of the deposit in respect of an application for a prospecting license for manganese in the Sorab Taluk. This is one of the applications in which the Shimoga Manganese Company was interested. The stale dated cheque was in this office letter No.280 dated 27th July 1912 to the Secretary of that Company offered to be returned in response to the application from the company for the refund of the deposit. The cheque being useless the Company did not evidently care to take it back.	Sent herewith 364 06.07
This cheque should have been returned to the party as it was an over payment in respect of prospecting license No.233 granted to Mr. Hurleston. It forms an enclosure to this office letter No.915, dated 9th September 1907. It was apparently not sent to the party by oversight.	— do — (75/05.06)
This cheque was received on account of the deposit in respect of an application for a prospecting license for manganese in the Sorab Taluk. This is one of the applications in which the Shimoga Manganese Co. was interested. The stale dated cheque was in this office letter No.280, dated 27th July 1912 to the Secretary of that Company offered to be returned in response to the application from the Co. for the refund of the deposit. The cheque being useless the Company did not evidently care to take it back.	— do — (9/07.08)
This cheque was received in respect of a portion of the rent payable for the renewal of prospecting licenses Nos. 50 and 54 granted to the Madras Mysore Mining Syndicate and ought to have been cashed and the amount credited to the Treasury before the licenses were renewed. The amount in question may be adjusted out of the deposit refundable in respect of the above and other licenses granted to the Syndicate.	— do — (105/05.08)
This was received in payment of the deposit in respect of a prospecting license in the Tarikere Taluk. The rent payable for the license was demanded from the applicant and there has been no response from him. According to the rules the deposit is liable to be confiscated to Government but the cheque is now stale dated and useless.	— do — 16/07.08
This cheque was received as deposit in respect of a prospecting license over a block of one sq. mile of land in the Seringapatam Taluk. The area over which the license was applied for was not free and the application was therefore rejected. The deposit is refundable to the party who died subsequent to the date of the application. An enquiry as to the representative to whom the amount should be returned has not brought any reply. No action is necessary.	— do — 392 06.07
This cheque was received on account of the rent in respect of the prospecting license offered to the party. An additional rent was demanded from the party owing to the increased rate of rent payable under the revised rules then issued. The party refused to pay the additional rent. The amount received from him was thereupon ordered to be returned but the cheque was kept back pending the replacement of the stale dated cheque for Rs.100 received on account of the deposit for the license. (Vide case No.12 above.)	— do — Same file referred to in No.12 of this list

MO.

Serial no.	Amount of cheque.	Number of cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	Received from
33.	100	A.074384	24-4-07.	C.B.Oakley.	Madras Bank.	H.E.Ormerod.
34.	500	A.043447	18-11-03.	Hector H. Bond.	Do.	Hector H.Bond.
35.	500	A.043448	21-11-03.	Do.	Do..	Do.
36.	100	A.000228	12-9-03.	W.T.Hamilton Holmes.	Do.	W.T.Hamilton Holmes.
37.	1000	G.90.	28-9-02.	J. Ingle.	Hajee Ismail Sait.	J. Ingle.
38.	500	825/B. 041229	31-3-00.	T.T.Leonard.	Madras Bank.	E.T.Read & T.T.Leonard.
39.	500	826/B. 041230.	Do.	Do.	Do.	C.E.Buckle & Colvin Leonard.

Kes.

History of the case

This cheque was received on account of the deposit in respect of an application for manganese in the Hosdurga Taluk. The major portion of the area was not free at the time of the application. The application was allowed to lie over pending prior applications. This is one of the applications in which the Shimoga Manganese Company was interested. The stale dated cheque was in this office letter No.280, dated 27th July 1912 to the Secretary of that Company offered to be returned in response to an application from the Company for the refund of the deposit. The cheque being useless, the Company did not evidently care to take it back.

Sent herewith (50/04-05) (302/06-07)

The aggregate amount of these two cheques, viz., Rs.1000, represents the deposit for a mining lease for asbestos applied for by the party in the Bangalore Taluk. The applicant was in the first instance offered a prospecting license which was subsequently converted into one for a mining lease. At the time of the application, there were no special rules in force for the grant of prospecting licenses for asbestos. The rules of 13th October 1897 which were applicable at the time were not revised; and in 1904 the applicant was offered a mining lease under the rules of March 1904. The applicant failed to execute the lease which was offered to him and finally represented that his attempts to find a market for asbestos were in vain. He was then offered the option of taking the lease or withdrawing his application on pain of the forfeiture of the deposit; but there has been no response from him. In view of the fact that the mining lease was offered to him several years after the date of the application, the case does not appear to warrant the forfeiture of the deposit. No action appears, therefore, to be necessary.

— do — (230/03-04)

This cheque was received as deposit in respect of prospecting license No.2 for Manganese. A mining lease has since been granted over the block selected under the terms of the prospecting license and a fresh deposit has been received in respect of the mining lease. The stale dated cheque received on account of the deposit for the prospecting license, which is no longer in force, may be returned to the party.

— do — (17/04-05)

This cheque was received on account of the deposit for a mining lease applied for in 1902. The rules for the grant of licenses and leases were then under revision and the lease was finally offered to the applicant in 1904. There has been no reply from the applicant. The deposit is refundable to him. The cheque may be returned to the party.

— do — (199/03-04)

This cheque was received on account of the fee for a prospecting license applied for in 1900. The rules for the grant of licenses and leases were then under revision and the license was finally offered to the applicant in 1904. There has been no reply from the applicant and the deposit is refundable to him. The cheque may be returned to the party.

— do — (213/03-04)

This cheque was received on account of the fee for a prospecting license applied for in 1900. The rules for the grant of licenses and leases were then under revision and the license was finally ordered to the applicant in 1904. There has been no reply from the applicant. The deposit is refundable to him. The cheque may be returned to the party.

— do — (214/03-04)

MEO.

Serial No.	Amount of cheque.	Number of cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	Received from.
40.	500	C.588672	12-6-99.	Hajee Ismail Sait.	National Bank of India.	Hajee Ismail Sait.
41.	1000	A.016756	6-5-99.	Tho. Leischman,	Madras Bank.	A.G.Grimley.
42.	1000	A.016775	23-3-99.	H.T.Ivatt.	Do.	H.T.Ivatt.
43.	500	A.096858	3-12-98.	Tho. Leischman.	Do.	Major Cole & A.G.Grimley.
44.	1000	20 A./ 92888 3917.	22-11-97.	R.Knight & Sons.	Bengal Bank.	R.Knight & Sons.
45.	500	A.074963.	6-11-97.	Ahmed Sait.	Madras Bank.	Hajee Ismail Sait & Abdul Rahim.
46.	Rs. 103- 8 as. 1 5 p. (103-8-5.)	24A.68829 4601	4-9-99.	R.Knight & Sons.	Bengal Bank.	R.Knight & Sons.

Kas.

History of the case.

This cheque was received on account of the fee for a prospecting license in the Srinivaspur and the Mulbagal Taluks applied for in 1899. The license was offered to the party in 1904. A fresh cheque for Rs.100 payable on account of the deposit under the revised rules was received and cashed. The stale dated cheque now in question may be returned to the party.	Sent herewith (40/04.05)
This cheque was received on account of the deposit for a mining lease in the Nanjangud Taluk applied for in May 1899. The lease was offered on 19th April 1904 after the issue of the rules of 2nd March 1904. The applicant has not responded to the offer and in view of the interval of 5 years between the date of application and the date of the offer of the lease, the deposit is returnable to the party and the cheque may be returned to him.	—do— (198/03a)
This cheque was received on account of a mining lease in the Kolar and Mulbagal Taluks applied for on the 23rd March 1899. On the issue of the revised rules of March 1904, the lease was offered to the applicant on the 12th October 1904; but there has been no reply from the party. In view of the long interval of 5 years between the date of the application and the offer of the lease, the deposit is refundable to the party. Hence, the cheque may be returned to him.	—do— (42/04.05)
This cheque was received on account of the fee for a prospecting license in the Nanjangud Taluk applied for by Major Cole and Mr. A.G.Grindley on the 3rd December 1898. The drawer of the cheque - Mr. T.Leischman - instructed the bank not to cash the cheque. The cheque having become valueless, the application was regarded as having been lapsed. No action necessary.	—do— (203/03a)
This cheque was received on account of the deposit for a mining lease applied for over the Bukkambudi Block in the Tarikere Taluk on 22nd November 1897. A mining lease over the block has been offered to, and accepted by, the applicants. The stale dated cheque has been replaced by the amount in cash which has been duly credited to the Treasury and the cheque has since been returned to the party.	—do— (173/03a) ✓
This cheque was received on account of the fee for a prospecting license in the Bowringpet Taluk applied for on the 6th November 1897. The license was offered in 1904 - after the issue of the revised rules of March of the same year. The offer was not accepted and the cheque is returnable to the party.	—do— (33/04.05)
This cheque was received on account of the charges for the survey and demarcation of the Bukkambudi Block in respect of the mining lease applied for by Messrs. Robert Knight & Sons. The cheque should have been cashed in due time. But as Messrs. Knight & Sons are yet to be granted the lease, the amount in question may be demanded from them and the cheque returned to them.	—do— Same file reference as in No 44 of the list.

W.O.

Serial no.	Amount of cheque.	Number of cheque.	Date.	Name of Drawer.	Bank on which drawn.	received from.	
	Rs.						
47.	100	236527.	18-2-07.	The Mysore Manganese Co., Ld.	The Mercantile Bank of India, Ld.	The Mysore Manganese Co., Ld.	
48.	100	239647.	28-2-07.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
49.	100	239644.	27-2-07.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
50.	100	239643.	Do.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
51.	100	239639.	25-2-07.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
52.	100	239640.	Do.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
53.	100	239645.	27-2-07.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
54.	100	213025.	3-6-07.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
55.	100	230367.	19-6-07.	Do.	Do.	Do.	

Bangalore Camp Golthal,
Dated: 13th April 1918.
23

Kss.

History of the Case.

Sent herewith

421 419 418
06-07 06-07 06-07

388 387 386
06-07 06-07 06-07

385 420 & 375
06-07 06-07 06-07

These cheques were received on account of the deposits for nine prospecting licenses for manganese within the reserved area from Ayanore. The licenses applied for were not granted and the cheques are returnable to the applicants.

B. Jaya Ram.

Offg. Director,
Department of Geology.

Note

On the annexed Cheques in favour of the Chiefs of Shiwa N'gandu as per Statt. prepared in that Office & appended hereto.

The Cheques pertain to applications for Mineral Licences & Leases under the Rules of Dec 1897 & April 1904 & 1906.

In respect of the applications under the Rules of 1897 it is submitted that the Licences received for the blocks known to be rich in Minerals were not deemed by Govt to be satisfactory the provisions generally being of so slight a character as deemed unsuitable & a revision of the Rules was started

had it took the long
period of seven years
to issue the usual
rule. This was quite
unanticipated by Mr. Smeeth
who considered that
it was unfair to the
applicants to keep
their deposits in Court
for a long period with
out any consideration
for them in return &
ordered that the Cheques
be kept over to be
replaced by fresh Cheques
or Cash if necessary
when the applications
were to be disposed of
finally. This position
was borne right of in the
office after the long inter-
val & the leaders were
informed without any
reference to the question
of deposits. These
remarks apply to
items 1 to 4 in the Statt.

the refunds applications
under the rules of 1906
they were mostly for
Manganese & Chrome.
But the rules framed were
considered unsuitable
and the applications
were held over pending
revision of the rules.
Further under the system
of Credit of departmental
receipts in this Dept
deposits were credited
to a Service head &
the refunds to parties
in cases where applications
were rejected involved
considerable delay.
We believe that
Govt officers at the head of
the Dept at the time
ordered that the charges
& Cash received as deposits
be held over & credited
~~after~~ at the time of issue
of the licence.

In several of these
cases there was a long
interval between the
application for the block
& the offer of it to parties

in a few cases the
rules regarding rents
were changed also in
the interval & applica-
tions of the revised
demands remained
undecided & the appeals
were never finally disposed
of. In each the cheques
presented with the
original applications
were never returned &
it was not clear also
what could be done
beyond cancelling the
applications.

An additional
reason in the case of
some of the cheques
was in respect of the
applications under
the rules of 1906 was
that a large number
of applications were
received from the new
Mysore Management Co
(now succeeded by the
Workington Co.) for
blocks constituted

he a reserve for them
in a large area round
Ayasama - thereby affi
the Construction of this
reserve the Court thought
thought it unfair
& kept the appeals
pending further Con-
sideration & the Cheques
were kept back.

In regards the
Cheques for deposits
in respect of the Zone
of the applications, it
may be observed that
that the applicants
had having been offered
the blocks at once or
before there were no benefits
which they enjoyed
& the mere reserve of
the area for them bein
ing a technical reserve.

In the Case of
the Cheques of the resti
there was absolutely
no reason to keep
them back & they should
have been held responsible

for the loss incurred on this account.

Generally, it must be admitted that the Cheques issued against the money orders have been with Government & under the rules regulating Lapsed deposits Some of the orders have become the property of Govt the Cheques however been kept back under orders for a time But there was no reason for the late accountant to have kept them by for good. The office here was to blame for not submitting files for final orders.

I have worked with Each file & tried reasons Wherever I think I can be done now.

In conclusion

all the confusion
due to the negligence
of an overworked accountant
- and now dead.
The office also was partly
responsible for not putting
up the rules for orders
Even after making
due allowance for the
confusion in consequence
on the large number
of applications and
the delay in the issue
of definite rules..

Yours obediently
Asst Leg. to
Govt
(Late Registrar
Mysore Civil Courts)

Bangalore
5 Mar 1918

No 747.

Encls:- 1 Statement with files to be sent to Mr Subbarao's note in original & 2 classified lists

2 letters

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND GEOLOGY,
MYSORE STATE.

Bangalore, 13th Sept. 1918.

4752
DIARY NO.....

Gol 53-8-2

Dear Sir,

In continuation of my D.O. letter No.438, dated the 9th August 1918, I beg to forward herewith a statement furnishing detailed information on the points referred to in your D.O. letter NO.G.16404, dated 31-5-1918, in respect of certain cheques that were kept uncashed in this Department. Two classified lists showing the cases in which the transactions fructified and those in which they did not fructify, as well as the amounts recoverable and those irrecoverable, are enclosed herein.

The files returned with your above mentioned letter are retransmitted herewith for reference and kind return.

Yours sincerely,

B. Jaya Rao.

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

I

Transactions fructified.

Serial numbers of cases in the statement dated 13-4-1918.	Name of party.	Amount. Rs.	Remarks.
	(a) Amounts still due to Government.		
	(1) Recoverable.		
1 and 2	Mr. Hajee Ismail Sait.	1000	
4	Messrs. Paul Knight and Robert Knight.	796-7-7	The amount of the cheque was Rs.1000/-, but only Rs.796-7-7 is recoverable (vide serial No.4 in the statement dated 11-9-1918.)
10	The Madras-Mysore Mining Syndicate.	50	
14	The Mysore Manganese Co., Ltd.,	100	
24	The Madras-Mysore Mining Syndicate.	200	
25	Mr. Ahamed Sait.	600	Only a sum of Rs.100/- can be adjusted by appropriation of the deposit of a like amount refundable to the party in respect of prospecting license No.182. It is not easy to say whether the balance of Rs.500 can be recovered from the party, but endeavour will be made to do so.
39	The Madras-Mysore Mining Syndicate.	100	
46	Messrs. R.Knight & Sons.	103-8-5	
	Total	2950	
	(2) Irrecoverable.		
3	Messrs Binny & Co.,	1000	This is the amount of the deposit ordered to be confiscated to Government. There is also a sum of Rs.403-12-0 due to Government on account of the rent and local cess for 1906 under Mining Lease No.107.
4	Messrs. Paul Knight and Robert Knight.	203-8-5	Vide serial No.4 in the statement dated 11-9-1918.
11	Late Mr.A.Maigandadeva Mdr.	150	
	Total	1353-8-5	
	(b) Amounts refundable to parties.		
9	Mr. C.B. Oakley.	100	
36	Mr. W.T.Hamilton Holmes.	100	
27	Mr. G.F. Baker.	100	Case of over-payment.
	Total	300	

Bangalore,
11th Sept. 1918.

B. Jayaram.
Offg. Director,
Department of Geology.

Transactions not fructified.

Serial numbers in the statement dated 13-4-1918.	Name of the party.	Amount. Rs.	Remarks.
	(a) Amounts liable to be confiscated to Government.		
	(1) Recoverable.		
21	Messrs. M. A. Lathief and Y. Nanjundayya.	10	
	Total	10	
	(2) Irrecoverable.		
5	Late Mr. Sutherland Orr.	500	
22	Mr. A. Hameed.	100	
30	Mr. F.E. Dunn.	100	
	Total	700	
	(b) Amounts refundable to parties.		
6	Mr. J.E. Limouzin.	100	
7	Mr. F.H. Oakley.	100	
8	Mr. A.S. Andrews.	100	
12	Mr. M. Byanna.	100	
13	Mr. C.B. Oakley.	100	
15 to 20	--do--	600	Consists of 6 items of Rs.100/- each.
21	Messrs. M.A. Lathief and Y. Nanjundayya.	90	
23	Mr. C.B. Oakley.	100	
26	--do--	100	
28	--do--	100	
31	Mr. H. Abraham.	100	
32	Mr. T. Byanna.	450	
33	Mr. H.E. Ormerod.	100	
34 & 35	Mr. Hector H. Bond.	1000	
37	Mr. J. Ingle.	1000	
38	Messrs. E.T. Read and T.T. Leonard.	500	
40	Mr. Hajee Ismail Sait.	500	
41	Mr. A.G. Grimley.	1000	
42	Mr. H.T. Ivatt.	1000	
43	Major Cole & Mr.A.G.Grimley.	500	
44	Messrs R. Knight & Sons.	1000	
45	Messrs Hajee Ismail Sait and Abdul Rahim.	500	
47 to 55	The Mysore Manganese Co.Ld.	900	Consists of 9 items of Rs.100/- each.
	Total	10540.	

Bangalore,
11th Sept. 1918.

B. Jayaram.
Offg. Director.
Department of Geology

Statement of uncashed cheques w i t h notes a n d recommendations

Serial No.	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received.	Number of cheque.	Amount of cheque. Rs.
1	Mr. Hajee Ismail Sait.	A.074976.	500
2	--do--	C.588182.	500
3	Messrs. Binny & Co.,	A.066406.	1000
	Messrs Paul Knight and Robert Knight.	22A.1043 / 4070	1000

in respect of the same.

Notes and recommendations.

The transactions relating to these cheques did fructify by the grant of a mining lease No.115 to Mr. Hajee Ismail Sait over Hajee's Block, but the party failed to get the lease registered and to pay the rent and local cess for the first year amounting to Rs.680/- in spite of repeated demands. On account of these defaults the cancellation of the lease and the adjustment of the arrears of rent, etc., out of the deposit was recommended in this office No. 3024 dated 29th March 1915, which is now before Government for orders. Since the cheques received on account of the deposit have not been cashed and are now stale and useless, there is no money available for the adjustment being made as recommended. A request made to the party on the 13th February 1918 to pay the amount of the cheques has been in vain, vide his letter dated 16th February 1918. (copy enclosed)

The party, however, holds another mining lease No.119 of the Krishnarajapur Block in respect of which we have a deposit of Rs.1000/-. A notice may now be issued to him that if the aforesaid arrears of Rs.680, which is still due to Government, are not paid at once, the same will be adjusted out of the deposit of Rs.1000/- held in respect of his mining lease No.119 of the Krishnarajapur Block and that that lease will also be cancelled.

The transaction relating to this cheque did fructify by the grant of mining lease No.107 to Messrs. Binny & Co., Owing to the non-compliance by the lessees of the terms of the lease in regard to the payment of rent and local cess and the commencement of mining operations within one year from the date of the lease and the provision of working capital, the lease has been cancelled and the deposit ordered to be confiscated to Government. The confiscation of the deposit has been ordered as a penalty for non-compliance of the terms of the lease. The cheque received on account of the deposit being stale and useless, there is virtually no money which can be confiscated to Government. The amount still due to Government by the lessees is Rs.403-12-0, rent and local cess for the year 1906, which is being shown as outstanding in the accounts of the Badamakanahally village, Bowringpet Taluk.

The present firm of Messrs. Binny & Co., who were addressed in the matter, have replied that the Company went into liquidation as far back as 31st October 1916, that their trustees have disposed of the assets and that there are no funds to meet the claim now made; vide, my letter No.54, dated the 6th July 1918. Under these circumstances, the only action to be taken is to write off the amount.

The transaction relating to this cheque did fructify by the grant of a mining lease, No.108, to the Messrs. P.Knight & R. Knight. Now the lease stands cancelled owing to non-compliance by the lessees with the terms thereof in regard to the commencement of mining operations and the provision of the prescribed capital. No orders have yet been passed by Government in regard to the disposal of the deposit.

The deposit is liable to be confiscated to Government as penalty for non-compliance with the aforesaid terms of the lease, but the cheque received on account of the same has not been cashed. Another cheque

for

5	Mr. Sutherland Orr.	S_S9015.	500
	Mr. J.E. Limouzan.	B.531881.	100
	Mr. F.H. Oakley.	B.048866.	100
8	Mr. A.S. Andrews.	B.533013.	100
9	Mr. C.B. Oakley.	C.801656.	100

for Rs.103-8-5 received from the same party on account of the charges for the survey and demarcation of the Bukkambudi Block (vide Case No.46 below) has not also been cashed.

There is, however, a sum of Rs.900/- refundable to the parties, as noted in the margin, in respect of the deposit of Rs.1000/- paid by them on account of the mining lease of the Bukkambudi Block, vide my letter No.404, dated 8-8-1918. The sum of Rs.103-8-5, due as above may be adjusted out of Rs.900, which is now refundable and the balance of the latter, viz,- Rs.796-7-7 confiscated to Government as penalty mentioned above.

Deposit. ...	Rs.1000/-	
Less a sum of.	" 100/-	to be appropriated therefrom on account of fee in respect of the application for a mining lease.
	Net Rs. 900/-	

There does not appear to be any advantage in taking any further steps for the recovery of the balance of Rs.203-8-5 confiscable in respect of the uncashed cheque.

The transaction in respect of this cheque cannot be considered to have fructified as no prospecting license was granted, but the applicant withdrew the application for the same.

The deposit of Rs.500/- in respect of which the cheque in question was received is liable to be confiscated to Government as penalty for the withdrawal of the application. The cheque is now useless and the party who was written to to replace the same, is now dead. No further action can be taken in the matter now.

The transaction did not fructify. The amount of the cheque is returnable to the party, but no claim has been made for the refund of the money, apparently because the party knows that the cheque has not been cashed. No further action is necessary.

-------do-------

-------do-------

The transaction fructified with the issue of prospecting license No.118, which now stands cancelled.

The amount of the cheque would have become returnable to the party if the same had been cashed and if he had complied with all the terms and provisions of the license, but the cheque has not been cashed, and there is, therefore, no question of refund. On the other hand, it is reported by the Deputy Commissioner that certain pits made under the license require to be filled in and that the work is estimated to cost Rs.169-6-0. The licensee has been called upon to fill up the pits to the satisfaction of the Deputy Commissioner. As he is interested in certain other licenses, there does not appear to be any difficulty in getting the above work done. No further action is necessary in regard to the cheque in question.

The

10	The Madras-Mysore Mining Syndicate.	168206.	50
11	Late Mr.A.Maigandadeva Moodr.,	A.070502.	150
12	Mr. M. Byanna.	E.35930.	100
13	Mr. C.B. Oakley.	A.074382.	100
14	The Mysore Manganese Co., Ltd.,	212955.	100
15	Mr. M.J. Limouzin.	A.074402.	100
16	Mr. E.E. Limouzin.	A.074403.	100
17	Mr. A.W. Kummer.	A.074404.	100
18	Mr. Philip A.Dingley.	A.074405.	100
19	Mr. S.C. Roberts.	A.074406.	100
20	Mr. J. Cartner.	A.074407.	100
21	Messrs M.A. Lattief and Y. Nanjundayya.	A.026546.	100

The transaction in this case did fructify as a prospecting license No.126 was issued to the party. The amount in respect of which the cheque was received, represents the rent payable for the grant of the license and is still due to Government.

As the cheque has not been cashed, the amount of the same may be appropriated out of the deposit of Rs.100/-, which is held by Government in respect of the same license and is refundable to the party.

The transaction in this case did fructify as prospecting license No.124 was issued to the party. The cheque received on account of the rent payable for the license should have been cashed forthwith.

The amount of the cheque is due to the Government, but the party is now dead, and the deposit held in respect of the license has already been refunded to him. The only course now left appears to be to write off the amount.

The transaction in this case did not fructify. The offer of the license to the applicant on payment of an enhanced rate of rent at Rs.100/- per square mile practically amounts to an offer of the license under special terms, for the non-acceptance of which the deposit cannot, strictly speaking, be confiscated to Government.

The deposit appears, therefore, to be one which is returnable to the party and as the cheque in question received in respect of the same is now stale and useless, no further action is necessary.

The transaction did not fructify. The amount of the cheque is, strictly speaking, returnable to the party, as the entire area over which he applied for the license was not offered to him. There has been no claim from the party for the refund of the money, apparently because he knows that the cheque has not been cashed. No further action is necessary.

The transaction in this case did fructify as prospecting license No.28 was renewed. The cheque in question received on account of rent for the period of the renewal should have been cashed forthwith.

The amount is still due to the Government and may be adjusted out of a sum of Rs.300/- paid by the Company on account of the deposit in respect of their application, dated 20-8-1907, and now standing to their credit, vide file No.70 of 1907-08

The transactions in these cases cannot be considered to have fructified, as no prospecting licenses were granted.

The deposits are forfeitable to the Government as penalty for non-payment of the rent demanded from the parties in respect of the licenses offered to them.

The cheques received on account of the deposits were, on certain representations made by the Secretary of the Shimoga Manganese Co., offered to be returned. The Company have not evidently cared to take back the cheques as they are stale and useless. No further action is necessary.

Transactions not fructified as the applicants withdrew their application. Only a sum of Rs.10/- charged as fee for the registration of the application is still due and has been demanded. This amount can be recovered from the parties. No action is necessary in respect of the stale cheque received on account of the deposit.

22	Mr. A. Hameed.	B.019399	100
23	Mr. P.A. Ramaiyya.	A.074412	100
24	M.M.M. Synd.	A.223763	200
25	Mr. Ahamed Sait.	B.534269	600
26	Mr. C.B. Oakley.	B.537971	100
27	Mr. G.F. Baker.	C.802078	100
28	Mr. C.B. Oakley.	A.078453	100
29	M.M.M. Synd.	230225/5774.	100

Transaction not fructified as no licenses were issued to the party.

The deposits are forfeitable to the Government as penalty for non-payment by the party of the rent demanded in respect of the licenses applied for.

Out of the two cheques for Rs.100/- each received from the party, on account of the deposits, one has been cashed and the amount thereof credited to Government. The claim for the amount of the uncashed cheque may be waived, as it represents the second deposit forfeitable as a penalty and there does not appear to be any advantage in pursuing the matter further.

The note against cases 15 to 20 applies to this case also.

The transaction in this case did fructify as prospecting license No.126 was issued to the party.

The amount in respect of which the cheque was received represents the rent payable for the grant of the license, and is still due to Government.

The Madras-Mysore Mining Syndicate is not at present existing and the amount of the cheque cannot, therefore, be recovered. There is, however, a deposit of Rs.100/- held in respect of the license and this may be appropriated towards a portion of the amount of the uncashed cheque and the balance of Rs.100/- may be adjusted out of the other deposits refundable to the Syndicate.

Transaction fructified by the grant of prospecting license No.182.

The amount of the cheque represents the rent payable for the grant of the license and is still due to Government.

There is a deposit of Rs.100/- refundable to the party in respect of ~~another~~ license No./82. ~~held by him.~~ This amount may be appropriated towards a portion of the rent due and an endeavour made to recover the balance of Rs.500/- from Mr. Ahamed Sait.

The note against cases 15 to 20 applies to this case also.

This is a case of an over-payment made by the party. No application for refund has been submitted by him, probably because he knows that the cheque has not been cashed and that there is, therefore, no money refundable to him.

No action is necessary.

The note against cases 15 to 20 applies to this case also.

The transaction in this case did fructify, as the licenses were duly renewed. The cheque in question received on account of the rent for the period of renewal should have been cashed when the licenses were renewed.

The amount of the cheque is still due to Government.

BG

The

30	Mr. F.E. Dunn.	A.073320	100
31	Mr. H. Abraham.	E.43599	100
32	Mr. T. Byannah.	E.35934	450
33	Mr. H.E. Ormerod.	A.074384	100
34	Mr. Hector H. Bond.	A.043447	500
35	--do--	A.043448	500
36	Mr. W.T. Hamilton Holmes.	A.000228	100
37	Mr. J. Ingle.	G.90.	1000

The Syndicate is not existing at present, but the amount due may, however, be adjusted out of the deposits refundable to the Syndicate in respect of these and other licenses.

The transaction cannot be considered to have fructified as no prospecting license was granted.

The deposit on account of which the cheque was sent by the party is forfeitable to the Government as a penalty for failure to pay the rent and take out the license. As the cheque has not been cashed, there does not appear to be any advantage in pursuing the matter any further.

Transaction not fructified, as the application for the prospecting license was rejected.

The amount of the cheque is refundable to the party, but there is no claim from him, probably because the cheque has not been cashed and there is money refundable to him. No action is necessary.

Transaction did not fructify, as no license was issued.

The amount of the cheque which was received on account of the rent for the grant of the license was ordered to be returned. The party submitted no claim for it, probably because the cheque has not been cashed. No action necessary now.

Transaction did not fructify, as the license applied for by the party was not offered to him.

The cheque received on account of the deposit was offered to be returned, but no claim has been made apparently because the cheque has not been cashed.

The transactions did not fructify. The amount of the cheque cannot, for reasons explained in the statement dated 13th April 1918, be regarded as still due to Government. No action appears necessary.

The transaction did fructify, as prospecting license No.2 was granted to the party.

The amount of the cheque which was sent by the party on account of the deposit for the license, is, however, refundable to the last holders of the license, viz,- The Workington Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., Shimoga, as a mining lease has since been granted to them on receipt of a fresh deposit. An application for the refund of the amount has been received. In answer thereto the fact that the cheque has not been cashed may be communicated to the party and the cheque returned to them

The transaction did not fructify, as the party did not care to take out the mining lease offered to him.

The amount is refundable to the party, but no claim has been made probably because the cheque has not been cashed. No action is necessary now.

38	Messrs E.T.Read and T.T.Leonard.	825/B.041229	500
39	" C.E.Buckle and Colvin Leonard.	826/B.041230	500
40	Mr. Hajee Ismail Sait.	C.588672	500
41	Mr. A.G. Grimley.	A.016756	1000
42	Mr. H.T. Ivatt.	A.016775	1000
43	Major Cole and Mr.A.G.Grimley.	A.096858	500
44	Messrs R. Knight & Sons.	20A.92888/3917.	1000
45	" Hajee Ismail Sait and Abdul Rahim.	A.074963	500
46	" R. Knight & Sons.	24A.68829/4601.	103-8-5
47	The Mysore Manganese Co., Ltd.,	236527	100
48	do.	239647	100
49	do.	239644	100
50	do.	239643	100
51	do.	239639	100
52	do.	239640	100
53	do.	239645	100
54	do.	213025	100
55	do.	230367	100

Bangalore,)
11 · 9 · 1918.) x

The transactions did not fructify, as the parties did not care to take out the mining leases offered to them.

The amounts are refundable to the parties, but no claims have been made probably because the cheques have not been cashed. No action is necessary now.

The transaction did fructify, as the Bukkambudi Block was duly surveyed and demarcated.

The amount of the cheque which was received on account of the charges for the survey and demarcation, is still due.

The amount may be recovered out of the deposit returnable to the party, vide this office letter No. 404 dated 8-8-1918 to the Chief Secretary to Government.

The transactions in these cases did not fructify as no prospecting licenses were granted.

The amount of the cheques is returnable to the parties, but the cheques have not been cashed. This fact may be communicated to the parties and the cheques returned to them.

Offg. Director,
Department of Geology.

Letter, dated 16th February 1918, from Mr. Haji Ismail Sait, English Warehouse, Bangalore, to the Offg.Director, Department of Geology.

I have the hnnour to acknowledge receipt of your No.1931, dated the 13th instant and note that the following two cheques aggregating to Rs.1,000/- forwarded by me on account of the deposit in respect of the Mining Lease No.115 granted to you by Government have not been cashed, and are therefore stale and useless.

(1) No.A074976 D/10th November 1897, on the Bank of Madras, for Rs.500-0-0.

(2) No.C588182 D/9th May 1899, on the National Bank of India, for Rs.500-0-0

Rs. 1000-0-0

I am somewhat surprised that the cheques issued so far back as 10th November 1897 & 9th May 1899, i.e., 20 years ago, are reminded for the first time by your letter under reply. I cannot understand the object of such a letter, as I have no recpllection of the transaction so far back as 20 years ago. There must be some good reason for the cheques not having cashed by you.

Copy.

M Varadarajan

for offg. Director

Department of Geology

12.9.18.

5 PM on 6.12.18 G

Govt Geol 53-18-3
Govt No. Fl 2737 & 10/12/18

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

-:0:-

Read --

Correspondence ending with letter, No.747 dated 13th September 1918, from the Officiating Director, Department of Geology, submitting, for the orders of Government, a statement showing certain cheques that were received ~~from~~ between the years 1897 & 1907, but kept uncashed in the Department, and stating that they were delivered by Mr. B. Subba Rao, late Registrar of the Department (Retired Assistant Secretary to Government in August 1917 and also forwarding a note submitted by Mr. Subba Rao on the subject.

Order No. G 10837-9 (Encls & Cash true packet) 9.12

Dated Bangalore 9 ~~Novr.~~ 1918

The irregularities now brought to light show the utmost neglect in the Department to safeguard Government revenue.

2. Government have already directed in their order No. Fl.2664-8/Geol.35-17-3 dated 28th November 1917, that no cash should be received in the Director's Office, that the system of accounts procedure should be revised and that a local audit of the accounts of the De-

Department should be conducted by the Comptroller once a year.

3. The cheques reported to be uncashed are 55 in number and amount to Rs.15,853-8-5 out of which a sum of Rs.9,750-0-0 (Vide Statement A) relates to cases in which the ~~uncashing~~ omission & cash has not given rise to any loss either to the party or to the Government, ~~and in which~~ In these cases no action is ~~therefore~~ necessary.

4. The balance of Rs.6,103-8-5 relates to cases in which financial liability continues.

This may be divided into the following classes.--

(a) Amounts due to Government and recoverable. . . Rs.3 353-8-5 (Vide Statement B)

(b) Amounts due to Government as penalty ~~and~~ irrecoverable. Rs.1,600-0-0 (Vide Statement C)

(c) Amounts due to Government as rent or ~~for~~ reimbursing expenditure incurred and irrecoverable ~~and causing therefore so much clear and absolute loss~~ Rs.1,150-0-0 (Vide Statement D)

5. After a careful consideration of the question, Government are pleased to direct that immediate action be taken to recover Rs.3.353-8-5 due from the parties concerned and the Director is requested to submit quarterly progress reports until the whole amount is recovered.

Rect.

6. ~~The~~ In regard to the items of Rs.1,600/- and Rs.1,150/- the officers responsible should make good the loss to Government.

The Comptroller is requested to withhold payment of the Insurance Bonus to Mr. B. Subba Rao, Retired Assistant Secretary to Government, pending final orders and regarding reimbursement of the amounts involved in the irregularities.

Dr. Smeeth is requested to submit on his return to Head Quarters his explanation regarding the irregularity.

15/11/48

Chief Secretary to Government

To

Director, Dept. of Geology.
Dr. Smeeth, M.A.,
The Comptroller to Government through the Financial Sectt.
The Secretary, Mysore State Life Insurance Committee.

R.D.

If the records relating to these irregularities will be placed before Dr Smeeth on his return to duty he will be requested to submit to Govt his remarks & explanations on the subject

Recd 20.11.48

Branch

A statement showing the various amounts & totals should go with the order

Please prepare one today

Thus,
W/Aks

Send Dr. with a statement

7.P.11.19

Done, so with typed copies of the statement

Thus
4/12

W AKS

Stte A

Statement showing cases in which the encashing of cheques has not given rise to any loss either to the party or to Govt and in which no action is necessary

Sl: no	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received	Number of cheque	Amount of cheque Rupees.
6	mr J.E. Limonjaw	B. 531881	100
7	" F.H. Oakley	B. 048866	100
8	" A.S. Andreos	B. 533013	100
12	" M. Byanna	E. 35930	100
13	" C.B. Oakley	A. 074382	100
27	" G.F. Baker	C. 802078	100
31	" H. Abrahams	E. 43599	100
32	" J. Byannah	E. 35934	450
33	" H.E. Grimrod	A. 074384	100
34	" Hector H Band	A. 043447	500
35	— do —	A. 043448	500
36	" W.T. Hamilton Holmes	A. 000228	100
37	" J. Engle	G. 90	1000
38	messrs E.T. Read & T.T. Leonard.	825/B. 041229	500
39	" C.E Buckle and Colvin Leonard	826/B. 04 1230	500
40	mr Hajee Ismail Sait	C. 588672	500
41	" A.G. Grimley	A. 016756	1000
42	" H.T. Pratt	A. 016775	1000
43	major Cole and mr A.G. Grimley	A. 096858	500
44	messrs R. Knight and Sons	20. A/2888/3917	1000
45	" Hajee Ismail Sait and Abdul Rahim —	A. 074963	500
47	The mysore manganese Co Ltd	236527	100
48	— do	239647	100
49	— do	239644	100
50	— do	239643	100
51	— do	239639	100
52	— do	239640	100
53	— do	239645	100
54	— do	213025	100
55	— do	230367	100
		Total	Rs 9750

Forwarded

Sch B

Statement showing the amounts due to Govt and Receivable

Sl: no	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received	number of cheque	Amount of cheque. Rs
1.	mr. Hajee Ismail Sait	A·074976	500
2.	— Do —	C 588182	500
4.	messrs Paul Knight and Robert Knight	22 A·1043/4070	1000
9.	mr. C. B. Oakley	C. 801656	100
10	The Madras - mysore mining Syndicate	168206	50
14	The Mysore manganese Co Ltd.	212955	100
21	mess: M. A. Latiff and J Nanjundayya	A·026546	100
24	mr. M. M. M. Synd	A 223763	200
25	" Ahamed Sait	B·534269	600
29	" M. M. M. Synd	230225/5774	100
46	messrs. R. Knight and Sons	24A·68829/4601	103-8-5
		Total Rs	3353-8-5

Forchief Secy

Sch D

Statement showing the amounts due to Govt as rent or ~~fees~~ Reimbursing Expenditure incurred and irrecoverable

D.

Sl: no	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received	number of cheque	Amount of cheque Rupees
3	Messrs: Binny and Co	A·066406	1000
11	Late mr. A Naigendadeva Mood[illegible]	A·070502	150
		Total	1,150

Forchief Secy

S4C

Statement showing the amounts due to Govt. as Penalty and irrecoverable ~~and involving no real loss to Govt~~

Sl: no.	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received	number of cheque	Amount of cheque Rs.
5	Mr: Sutherland Bro	SS 9015	500
15	" M.T. Limouzin	A.074402	100
16	" E.E- Do-	A.074403	100
27	" A.W. Kummel	A.074404	100
18	" Philip A Dingley	A.074405	100
19	" S.C. Roberts	A.074406	100
20	" J. Cabnes	A.074407	100
22	"A Hameed	R.n.9399	100
23	" P.A. Ramaiyya	A.074412	100
26	" C.B. Oakley	B.537971	100
28	" Do —	A.078453	100
30	" J.E. Dunn	A.073320	100
		Total	1600

For chief secy to govt

Statement showing cases in which the uncashing of cheques has not given rise to any loss either to the party or to Government and in which no action is necessary.

Sl. No.	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received.	Number of cheque.	Amount of cheque Rupees.
6	Mr. J.E.Limouzan	B 531881	100
7	" F.H.Oakley	B 048866	100
8	" A.S.Andrews	B 533013	100
12	" M.Byanna	E 35930	100
13	" C.B.Oakley	A 074382	100
27	" G.F.Baker	C 802078	100
31	" H.Abraham	E 43599	100
32	" T.Byannah	E 35934	450
33	" H.E.Ormerod	A 074384	100
34	" Hector H. Bond	A 043447	500
35	Do	A 043448	500
36	" W.T.Hamilton Holmes	A 000228	100
37	" J. Ingle	G 90	1000
38	Messrs. E.T.Read & T.T.Leonard	825/B 041229	500
39	" C.E.Buckle and Colvin Leonard	826/B 041230	500
40	Mr. Hajee Ismail Sait	C 588672	500
41	" A.G.Grimley	A 016756	1000
42	" H.T.Ivatt	A 016775	1000
43	Major Cole and Mr. A.G. Grimley	A 096858	500
44	Messrs. R.Knight and Sons	20 A 92888/3917	1000
45	" Hajee Ismail Sait and Abdul Rahim	A 074963	500
47	The Mysore Manganese Co., Ltd.,	236527	100
48	Do	239647	100
49	Do	239644	100
50	Do	239643	100
51	Do	239639	100
52	Do	239640	100
53	Do	239645	100
54	Do	213025	100
55	Do	230367	100
			Rs 9750

For Chief Secretary to Government.

B

Statement showing the amounts due to Government and recoverable.

Sl. No.	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received.	Number of Cheque.	Amount of cheque, Rupees.
1	Mr. Hajee Ismail Sait	A 074976	500
2	Do	C 588182	500
4	Messrs. Paul Knight and Robert Knight.	22A 1043/4070	1000
9	Mr. C.B.Oakley	C 801656	100
10	The Madras ~~Manager~~ Mysore Mining Syndicate	168206	50
14	The Mysore Manganese Co. Ltd.,	212955	100
21	Messrs. M.A.Latheef and Y. Nanjundaiyya	A 026546	100
24	Mr. M.M.M. Synd	A 223763	200
25	" Ahamed Sait	B 534269	600
29	" M.M.M.Synd	230225/5774	100
46	Messrs. R.Knight and Sons	24A 68829/4601	103-8-5.
			Rs 3353-8-5.

C

Statement showing the amounts due to Government as penalty and irrecoverable.

Sl. No.		Name of the party from whom the cheque was received.	Number of cheque.	Amount of cheque, Rupees.
10-8-07 5		Mr. Sutherland Orr	S S 9015	500
15	22-5-07	" M.F.Limouzin	A 074402	100
22/5/07 16		" E.E.Limouzin	A 074403	100
17	do	" A.W.Kummer	A 074404	100
18	do	" Philip A Dingley	A 074405	100
19	do	" S.C.Roberts	A 074406	100
20	do	" J.Cartner	A 074407	100
22	29-5-07	" A.Hameed	B 019399	100
23	3-6-07	" P.A.Ramaiyya	A 074412	100
26	5-6-07	" C.B.Oakley	B 537971	100
28	6-7-07	" Do	A 078453	100
30	19-7-07	" F.E.Dunn	A 073320	100
				Rs 1600

For Chief Secretary to Government.

Statement showing the amounts due to Government as rent or for reimbursing expenditure incurred and irrecoverable.

Sl. No.	Name of the party from whom the cheque was received.	Number of cheque.	Amount of cheque Rupees.
3	Messrs. Binny & Co.	A 066406	1000
11	Late Mr. A.Maigunda-deva Mudaliar.	A 070502	150
			Rs 1150

For Chief Secretary to Government.

133922
KY NO.....

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Geol 53-8-4

Read again :-

Government Order No.10837-9/Geol.53-18-3 dated 9th December 1918 regarding certain irregularities in the matter of realising the amount of cheques received in the Department of Geology and directing the Comptroller to withhold payment of the Insurance bonus due to Mr. B.Subba Rao, Retired Assistant Secretary to Government, pending final orders fixing responsibility for reimbursing Government for the loss sustained in the delay in cashing them.

Read also :-

Mr. B. Subba Rao's representation dated 7th January 1919 in the matter of the hardship and inconvenience caused to him by the withholding of the amount of his Insurance bonus.

Order No. H 3835-7 / 57-147-18

Dated Bangalore the 6th February 1919.

Government direct that a sum of Rs.-1600/- be paid to Mr. B.Subba Rao out of his Insurance bonus, pending final orders in the matter dealt with in the order of 9th December 1918 read above.

For Financial Secretary to Govt.

To
The Comptroller, Mysore Government.
The Secretary, Mysore State Life Insurance Committee.
The Director, Departments of Mines and Geology.
Copy to Chief Secretariat.

MM.4.
RB

WD 01085—GPB—1,000—20-7-16

D.M.G. 13]

No 2359

BANGALORE, 22nd February 1919.

14750

Geol 53-8

Ch Secy
24 FEB 1919
CHIEF SECRETARIAT
24 FEB 1919

FROM

DR. W. F. SMEETH, M.A., D.Sc., A.R.S.M., etc.,
Director, Department of Mines and Geology,
Mysore State.

To

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

SIR,

Adverting to para 8 of Government Order No.G.10837-9/ Geol.53-18-3, dated 9th December 1918, regarding certain cheques which were received between the years 1897 and 1907, but were kept uncashed in this Department, I have the honor to offer the following remarks and explanations in regard to the statements B, C & D accompanying the said Government Order.-

Statement B.

2. The cases included in this statement are being dealt with and endeavours are being made to recover the amounts due. A report will be submitted at the end of the quarter.

Statement C.

3. These are all cases in which it is sought to forfeit deposits on account of applicants not taking licenses which were offered to them.

4. With regard to forfeiting the deposit or any portion thereof in the event of an applicant declining to accept a license,

I

I may point out that for many years no such forfeiture was ever contemplated or effected. It is very doubtful if we are legally entitled under the Rules to forfeit the deposit on this account.

Manganese boom

5. After the rush for licenses in 1906-07, I considered the advisability of introducing some penalty for an applicant who put us to the trouble of considering his application and then refused to take the license when offered.

6. At first I thought we might forfeit a portion of his deposit and in the Draft Rules forwarded to the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore with my letter No.609, dated 2nd September 1908, the necessity for some penalty was pointed out and Draft Rules Nos.17, 18 and 19 were proposed to enable us to confiscate a portion of the deposit.

7. The Draft Rules were discussed by me with Sir Thos. Holland who considered that such confiscation was objectionable as under our Rules the deposit is to be held as security for due fulfilment of the terms of the license and subject to any deductions in this respect is returnable to the licensee. If no license is granted, I think it very doubtful if we can legally forfeit the deposit. It had not been the practice to do so and as the wording of the Rules on the point were not clear, I sent up to the Dewan a Revised Draft of Rules with my Memo of 3rd January 1910.

8. In this Revised Draft, which was approved and Rules issued in October 1910, an application fee was provided for, which was confiscated to Government if the application was withdrawn or the license not accepted.

9. Under these Rules the deposit could not be confiscated and the whole procedure was defined and regularized by Rules 21, 22 and 23 of October 1910.

10. Under these circumstances we may consider that prior to this date we had no legal or just claim to retain the deposit as a penalty for the withdrawal of an application or refusal to accept a license.

11. All of the cases in statement C accompanying the Government Order referred to above, come under these conditions.

The applications were all made under the Rules of 1904 and 1906, in which no specific penalties are provided for withdrawing an application or declining to accept a license and any attempt to forfeit the deposit under such a general Rule as Rule 16 of March 1904 or June 1906 would be at least academically objectionable and probably legally indefensible.

12. For these reasons I am of opinion that we have no claims against the licensees mentioned in statement C and that no loss has accrued to Government owing to non-cashment of the cheques.

There is much force in this argument. It seems to me Reel

13. Apart from these reasons there are others which would preclude Government from exacting a penalty. The applications were all received during the rush of 1906-07 and the disposal of the applications were much delayed owing to the number to be dealt with and to the fact the Government ordered applications to be held in abeyance for some time during reconsideration of the Rules for Manganese. By the time the licenses were offered the conditions of the Manganese market had altered so much that it was not worth while for the applicants to take them up and we cannot either blame them or penalize them for refusing to accept licenses which would have been practically worthless when offered.

14. In my opinion, therefore, we have no legal or moral claims against these deposits and all of the cases in statement C should be transferred to statement A.

Statement

Statement D.

15. Serial No.3. The cheque for Rs.1000/- was paid by Messrs. Binny & Co., as deposit for a lease with their application, dated 10th March 1898.

A number of applications were received about the same time and they were kept in abeyance pending decision of Government as to revised Rules, Royalties, &c. As the revision was obviously going to be a very protracted matter, I consulted Sir Sheshadri Iyer as to whether the cheques should be cashed or returned to the applicants. He said that it would be unfair to cash them as Government saw no prospects of disposing of the applications for a long time and directed that the cheques might simply be retained pending the revision of the Rules.

16. The Revision was not effected until March 1904 and the application was finally disposed of and Lease No.107 issued in June 1905 - or 7 years after the application.

17. By an oversight in the Office the fact that the cheque received as deposit had not been cashed was not noted when the lease was issued. It is very difficult to say who could be held responsible for the oversight.

18. Mr. Kincaid Lee was Registrar in 1898 when the cheque was received and has not recorded any note as to what was done with it. He left the Department in 1904.

19. At the date of issue of the lease in 1905 Mr.Wetherell was acting as Secretary to Government, during my absence on leave, and Mr. Setlur was acting for Mr. Subba Rao as Registrar. C.A.Singaiyengar was Accountant at the time and has since died.

20. The case is an exceptional one and has passed through many hands and I doubt if definite responsibility can be

assigned

assigned to any one. I would suggest that, under the circumstances, the default be condoned and the amount be regarded as irrecoverable.

22. Serial No.11. The cheque in question was received for rent on Prospecting License No.126.

It was handed over to the Accountant C. Singaiyengar who has noted its receipt. Apparently he put it in the office safe and took no steps to realize the amount. He is the person primarily responsible for the loss, but he is now dead and I do not think any further action possible.

23. I do not think that Mr. Subba Rao - as Head of the Office - exercised sufficient supervision and control over the work of the Accountant, but I don't know how far he can be held responsible for specific default on the part of the Accountant or how far either the Registrar or I as Head of the Department can be held responsible - except in a general way for not having had a better organization.

Some general observations on the non-cashment of cheques.

24. I have now studied a number of these cases and found that they fall under the following heads.-

(a) Cheques received with applications, but no lease or license granted.

(b) Cheques representing deposits on leases or licenses granted.

(c) Cheques paid for rents.

25. With regard to (a) it is no doubt desirable that the cheques should be cashed when received, but there is no definite rule about it.

I have referred above to the special case of cheques received about 1897-8, which Sir Sheshadri Iyer directed me to keep pending a settlement of the Rules, which took many

years

years.

During the Manganese rush of 1905-6 the Rules were again under consideration of Government and it was not possible to dispose of many applications and the applications were ordered to be held in abeyance.

According to Mr. Subba Rao, Mr. Wetherell who was in charge of the Department during that period directed that the cheques received should be retained until Government decided what to do about the applications. This was not brought to my notice on my return in December 1906 and I was totally unaware that a large number of cheques were being held in the office. Had I known I might very possibly have approved of the practice under the existing circumstances, but I would also have taken special trouble to ascertain if these cheques were cashed or other cheques obtained before disposing of the applications.

As pointed out above, I do not consider that the retention of cheques in cases where no licenses or leases have been granted has resulted in any loss. This has been made clear by our more recent Rules, which do not require the payment of any deposit until the lease or license has been sanctioned and accepted.

(b) Where leases or licenses were granted it was incumbent that the deposits should have been realized. The ordinary procedure was for the cheque to be cashed on receipt of the application and cheques were regularly presented to me for endorsement to the Comptroller or Treasury. I had no idea that some were being kept back and when a license was put up before me for signature, which contained the definite statement that so many Rupees were held as deposit, I naturally concluded that they were so held. It is inconceivable to me why these cheques were kept back. An

occasional

occasional instance might be due to carelessness or remissness but it looks as if there were some other reasons when so many cases have been brought to light.

Yes. This is what makes the whole thing look very suspicious Pell.

The Accountant Singaiyengar was primarily responsible as the cheques were handed to him and their receipt noted by him. Mr. Subba Rao may not have known that cheques which ought to have been cashed were being retained, but as he admits that some cheques were ordered to be kept back pending disposal of applications he should have taken special care to see that the deposits were actually credited before submitting licenses for signature.

He cannot be absolved of responsibility in this case; as Rejinkar it was incumbent upon him to have seen to it himself. Pell.

(c) In the case of rents due there can have been no question as to delaying the crediting of the amounts to Government. The cheques appear to have been handed over to the Accountant and he is responsible for not having sent them to the Treasury. I don't know how far Mr. Subba Rao can be held responsible in such cases. It seems to me that the system of accounts or records cannot have been a good one - they have always appeared to me to be very involved, but then I do not profess to understand accounts and would not venture to offer any opinion in the matter.

No papers were kept also at all. It seems to me Pell

26. One further point is noteworthy in connection with this subject.

Mr. B. Jayaram as Offg. Director of Geology has furnished a report, dated 11th January 1918, on Government Order No.H.2064-8, dated 28th November 1917.

27. In para 7 (3) of that report he states that Dr.Smeeth took over charge on the 11th May 1906 and that it is not understood why neither Dr.Smeeth nor the Comptroller took steps to see that the Government Order of 1906 was fully carried out.

28. With reference to these observations I would like to point out that I did not return to duty until the 11th December 1906.

29. I was away on leave from May 1905 until December 1906. During the greater part of the period from January to June 1907 I was on tour and I was on deputation in Europe from October 1907 to January 1908.

30. During this long period from May 1905 to January 1908 I was, therefore, very much out of touch with the office and neither the Government Order of 17th January 1906 nor the unofficial correspondence, relating to the audit of the accounts of the Department and the appointment of a Committee, contained in the General Finance File No.179 of 1905-06, has ever been brought to my notice.

31. I have seen these papers for the first time within the last few days. I believe Mr. Subba Rao had kept them with him.

32. I have never had any account of the audit which appears to have taken place in 1905, no suggestion has ever been made to me that there was anything suspicious or irregular about the accounts or that they required overhauling.

33. Had any of these matters been brought to my notice I do not think that I could have failed to arrange that cheques would not have been retained in office or licenses issued without the deposits being duly realized and even at that time I could have saved the greater portion of the trouble which has arisen from the stale cheques.

34. I do not want to shirk any responsibility or throw undeserved blame on others, but I cannot help feeling that I have been very badly let in. Office management and accounts was the one part of the work of the Department of which I had

no

no knowledge or experience, but I was provided with an experienced staff to which I left this branch. In all the technical branches I had to train the staff and organize and supervise the work and these branches soon became very heavy and demanded more time than I had available for them.

35. I have now dealt with the general aspects of the question and with the cheques in statements C and D.

36. I shall deal with those in statement B as directed and endeavour to obtain fresh cheques from the drawers.

37. Some cases in statement A will probably require further consideration and I will go into these as soon as possible.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Director,

Department of Mines and Geology.

cvv

Two drafts 25
Geol53-18-6

Proceedings of the Government of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

G.O. No.G.10837-9/Geol.53-18-3 dated 9th December 1918 stating that, out of the sum of Rs. 15853-8-5 relating to 55 cheques reported to have been kept uncashed no action was necessary on - items shown in statement A appended thereto aggregating ~~to~~ a sum of Rs. 9750/-, ~~and~~ directing that a sum of Rs.3353-8-5 - should be recovered from the parties - concerned(as shown in statement B appended thereto), and that the sum of Rs.1600/- referred to in statement C and of Rs 1150/- referred to in statement D should be - made good by the officers responsible & ~~that~~ the records relating to the irregularities be placed before Dr. W.F. Smeeth on his return to ~~this~~ duty and ~~that~~ his remarks and explanations ~~be~~ submitted to Government.

Signed by Mr M.V. Ryengar

2. Letter No. 2359 dated 22-2-1919 from the Director, Department of Mines & Geology furnishing his remarks and explanations on the subject.

Order No. G 28470-71 Dt 24-6-19
Dated,

The Director reports that he is - taking action to recover the amounts shown in statement B. The reports showing the progress made in the recovery of these amounts

~~arrears~~ amounts are awaited.

2. The Director also states that the amounts shown in statement C were all deposits under the rules of 1904 and 1906 which had no clear provision for forfeiture on non-acceptance by an applicant of a license or lease offered by Government on application. ~~As the sum~~ For this reason and because the sum of Rs. 1600/- shown in this statement is reported to be irrecoverable and does not involve any actual loss to Government, also Government are pleased to direct that, in regard to these items as well as to the case of those previously included in statement A, no action need be taken.

Paras 78 & 84 of rules

3. The sum of Rs. 1000 referred to in statement D relating to cheque No. A066406 may be written off the accounts as the Director reports that primary responsibility cannot be fixed on any person within reach now. The second item of Rs. 150/- in statement D must be recovered from Mr. B. Subba Rao as he failed to exercise sufficient control and supervision over the work of the accountant Rangaraja, since deceased.

Paras 72 & 79 of rules

Do subject to approval

4. The further report in regard to certain items included in statement A in the order read above promised by the Director, Department of Mines & Geology in the last para of the letter read above is awaited.

5. Separate orders will issue in regard to Mr. Sweet's explanation of the circumstances in which timely action was not taken on the cheques tendered by parties in the above cases.

PWD

7.4.49

13.5.49

7.4.49

for Chief Secretary to Govt.

To

The Director, Deptt. of Mines & Geology.
The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

Copy to the Finl. Sectt.

CP.